

# Exhibit 4

RE: Rich v. Butowsky et al, No. 1:18-cv-006810-RJL

---

From: Michael Gottlieb (mgottlieb@bsfllp.com)

To: tyclevenger@yahoo.com; MGovernski@BSFLLP.com

Cc: RJackson@BSFLLP.com; ken@martin-lawfirm.com; allen.farber@dbr.com; suzanne.dufrane@dbr.com; james.barker@dbr.com; mattcouch@af-mg.com

Date: Monday, August 20, 2018, 09:32 PM EDT

---

Thank you for confirming in writing that you continue to practice law in D.C. without authorization to do so.

---

**From:** Ty Clevenger [mailto:tyclevenger@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2018 9:29 PM

**To:** Meryl Governski; Michael Gottlieb

**Cc:** Randall Jackson; Ken Martin; Allen V. Farber; Suzanne Dufrane; Barker Jr. James A.; Matt Couch

**Subject:** Re: Rich v. Butowsky et al, No. 1:18-cv-006810-RJL

I still serve as Mr. Butowsky's personal attorney, and I am involved directly or indirectly in all of his cases. I'm not sure why any of that matters. The first question pertained to a case in NY, not DC. The other question, frankly, was for purposes of my blog. If you and your client were serious about getting answers, you wouldn't be dragging your feet and making excuses. Your bluff has been called, and I think you know it.

On Monday, August 20, 2018, 9:19:10 PM EDT, Michael Gottlieb <[MGottlieb@BSFLLP.com](mailto:MGottlieb@BSFLLP.com)> wrote:

Mr. Clevenger,

You have sent two emails today (one copied below) purporting to ask us questions regarding the lawsuit our client Aaron Rich filed against the Washington Times, Mr. Butowsky, Mr. Couch, and America First Media in the District of Columbia, Case No. 1:18-cv-00681-RJL. Do you currently represent any party in that action? If so, which party do you represent? Do you contend that you are authorized to continue acting on behalf of a party in this litigation notwithstanding that you are not admitted to practice in D.C. and you withdrew your motion to appear pro hac vice? Or perhaps you are now authorized to practice law in D.C. If that is the case, please let us know.

Regards,

Mike

**Michael J. Gottlieb**

Partner

---

**BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP**

1401 New York Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005

(t) +1 202 237 9617

(m) +1 202 744 0858

[mgottlieb@bsflfp.com](mailto:mgottlieb@bsflfp.com)

[www.bsflfp.com](http://www.bsflfp.com)

---

**From:** Ty Clevenger [<mailto:tyclevenger@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2018 7:58 PM

**To:** Meryl Governski

**Cc:** Michael Gottlieb; Randall Jackson; Ken Martin; Allen V. Farber; Suzanne Dufrane; Barker Jr. James A.; Matt Couch

**Subject:** Re: Fw: Re: RE: Clevenger v. DOJ, et al., 18-CV-01568 (WFK) (LB)

Ms. Governski,

Per the article below, the Democratic National Committee served its lawsuit on Wikileaks via Twitter. I'm wondering why your client has not tried to subpoena Wikileaks via Twitter. I'm also wondering why your client has not served subpoenas on eBay for payments into the accounts of companies controlled by Mr. Rich. Mr. Butowsky would have issued his own subpoenas by now, but he does not wish to consent to the jurisdiction of the D.C. court.

Ty Clevenger

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/dnc-serves-wikileaks-with-lawsuit-via-twitter/>

On Monday, August 20, 2018, 6:01:33 PM EDT, Ty Clevenger <[tyclevenger@yahoo.com](mailto:tyclevenger@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Ms. Governski,

Below is FYI. As you can see, there seems to be a conflict between the FBI's version of events and the complaint that you filed on behalf of your client. Would you mind explaining which federal law enforcement officials your

client was cooperating with?

Ty Clevenger

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Ty Clevenger <[tyclevenger@yahoo.com](mailto:tyclevenger@yahoo.com)>

**To:** Mahoney, Kathleen (USANYE) <[Kathleen.Mahoney@usdoj.gov](mailto:Kathleen.Mahoney@usdoj.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2018, 5:37:32 PM EDT

**Subject:** Re: RE: Clevenger v. DOJ, et al., 18-CV-01568 (WFK) (LB)

Kathleen,

I've attached a copy of the complaint that Seth Rich's brother filed against my client, Ed Butowsky. Here's an excerpt from Paragraph 4: "For well over a year, Aaron [Rich] has devoted countless hours assisting state and federal law enforcement officials investigating the murder."

According to my sources, the federal law enforcement officials were FBI agents. I know discovery is not typical in a FOIA case, but I'll probably request depositions from one or two FBI officials on this subject. Let me know if you want to discuss in advance of the teleconference. Thanks.

Ty

On Monday, August 20, 2018, 12:54:49 PM EDT, Mahoney, Kathleen (USANYE) <[Kathleen.Mahoney@usdoj.gov](mailto:Kathleen.Mahoney@usdoj.gov)> wrote:

In response to your inquiry, the FBI advised that its searches of ACS and Sentinel found no main or cross reference records. They also reached out to the Washington, D.C. Field Office, which confirmed that D.C. Police had declined the FBI's assistance. They did not reach out to CART since the FBI did not assist in the investigation. However, if CART records existed, they would have been located through the ACS and/or Sentinel searches.

Kathleen A. Mahoney

Assistant U.S. Attorney

Eastern District of New York

271-A Cadman Plaza East, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor

Brooklyn, New York 11201

(718) 254-6026

---

**From:** Ty Clevenger <[tyclevenger@yahoo.com](mailto:tyclevenger@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, August 16, 2018 10:28 AM

**To:** Mahoney, Kathleen (USANYE) <[KMahoney2@usa.doj.gov](mailto:KMahoney2@usa.doj.gov)>

**Subject:** question

Do you know whether the FBI searched for records with its Computer Analysis and Response Team ("CART")(URL below)? My understanding is that team assisted D.C. police in retrieving data from Seth Rich's electronic devices.

**FBI Laboratory: Computer Analysis and Response Team**

---

The information contained in this electronic message is confidential information intended only for the use of the named recipient(s) and may contain information that, among other protections, is the subject of attorney-client privilege, attorney work product or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this electronic message is not the named recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the named recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited and no privilege is waived. If you

have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this electronic message and then deleting this electronic message from your computer. [v.1]

---

The information contained in this electronic message is confidential information intended only for the use of the named recipient(s) and may contain information that, among other protections, is the subject of attorney-client privilege, attorney work product or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this electronic message is not the named recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the named recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited and no privilege is waived. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this electronic message and then deleting this electronic message from your computer. [v.1]